REMARKS

Claims 1-35 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26, and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,386 to Arun ("Arun"). The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 10, 12-14, 17, 24, 27-32, and 35 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Arun in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,684,990 to Boothby ("Boothby").

Claims 1-4, 9, 12, 19, 25, 28-30, and 33-35 are amended herein. Claim 18 is cancelled herein. Claims 36-47 have been added. Applicants now request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 and 19-47. This amendment of the claims is made so as to more clearly define the invention, and not to narrow their scope of protection with respect to the prior art, or with respect to potentially infringing devices/compositions/articles.

The Examiner rejects 1-2, 4-9, 11, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26, and 33-34 under § 102 as being anticipated by Arun. This rejection is now traversed.

Applicants' invention as recited, for example in amended independent claim 1 is:

1.	On a computer capable of implementing version control, a method comprising:

storing an associative array comprising a plurality of key/value pairs;

providing a version control system on the computer; and

applying a version control operation within the version control system to the associative

array to provide version control to at least one of the plurality of key/value pairs

of the associative array, the version control system allowing a user to check the

associative array in and out of the system and to edit the associative array when it

is checked out of the version control system.

Claim 1 is directed to providing version control operations for an associative array, which is clearly recited as having "a plurality of key/value pairs." Examples of an associative array are found throughout applicants' specification, such as in Fig. 2a, which shows a plurality of name value pairs. The associative array in this example contains the key "NAME" in association with the value "Bob" and so on.

Moreover, claim 1 recites that a user can check an associative array in and out of a version control system.

In contrast, Arun, discusses a conventional relational database management system, such as DBMS 12 of Fig. 1. See, for example, col. 4, lines 49-65. As is known and discussed in Arun, a conventional relational database management system is formed of tables in which each row represents a record and each column represents a field of the record. Relational databases do not explicitly contain key/value pairs as recited in claim 1 and it is known in the art that the order or the columns matters in what search results are returned from the tables. Therefore, Arun completely fails to disclose or suggest a system that performs version control on an associative array having a plurality of key/value pairs. Independent claims 1, 22, 25, 28, and 33 are patentable for at least this reason.

Moreover, Arun clearly <u>teaches away from</u> a system and method in which the version control system allows a user to check the associative array in and out of the system and to edit the associative array when it is checked out of the version control system. In col. 21, lines 48-67, Arun explicitly teaches away from versioning systems using checking/checkout. Thus, Arun fails to disclose or suggest claim 1 and independent claims 25 and 33 for at least this additional reason.

Independent claim 28 was rejected over the combination of Arun and Boothby. Independent claim 28 relates to a first and a second computer system in which a first user computer and a second user computer are capable of operating independently in a peer to peer replicated environment in which the first user computer and the second user computer cannot communicate for with each other for periods of time. Such a system is not disclosed or suggested in the combination of Arun and Boothby and claim 28 is patentable for at least this additional reason. Boothby completely fails to remedy the shortcomings of Arun as discussed above. Moreover, the dependent claims of independent claims 1, 22, 25, 28, and 33 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their corresponding independent claims.

New dependent claims 36-39 relate to a *delta* version control operation that can be applied to an associative array. The nature of associative arrays requires that they be treated in a special way by a version control system. As recited in claim 36, for example, a change in the order of key value pairs in an associative array is not considered to be a change to the associative array (see, e.g., Fig. 4) and is not noted as a change when the delta operation is applied to an associative array. This differs from a conventional DBMS in which the order or the data affects query results.

New dependent claims relate to a *commit* version control operation that can be applied to an associative array. As recited in claim 40, for example, a change in the order of key value pairs in an associative array is not considered to be a change to the array (see, e.g., Fig. 4) and is not noted as a change when the commit operation is applied to an associative array. This differs from a conventional DBMS in which the order or the data affects query results.

New independent claims 46 and 47 relate, respectively, to the delta and commit version control operations. None of new claims 36-47 are disclosed or suggested by Arun.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 1-17 and 19-47 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
LAWRENCE W. MCVOY, ET AL.

Date: _Aug 28, 2006_   By: _Laura Majerus_

Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7152
Fax: (650) 938-5200